

Simple realizability of complete abstract topological graphs simplified*

Jan Kynčl

Department of Applied Mathematics and Institute for Theoretical Computer Science,
Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics,
Malostranské nám. 25, 118 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic;
kyncl@kam.mff.cuni.cz

École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Chair of Combinatorial Geometry,
EPFL-SB-MATHGEOM-DCG, Station 8, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

Abstract

An *abstract topological graph* (briefly an *AT-graph*) is a pair $A = (G, \mathcal{X})$ where $G = (V, E)$ is a graph and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \binom{E}{2}$ is a set of pairs of its edges. The AT-graph A is *simply realizable* if G can be drawn in the plane so that each pair of edges from $\mathcal{X}$ crosses exactly once and no other pair crosses. We show that simply realizable complete AT-graphs are characterized by a finite set of forbidden AT-subgraphs, each with at most six vertices. This implies a straightforward polynomial algorithm for testing simple realizability of complete AT-graphs, which simplifies a previous algorithm by the author. We also show an analogous result for independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability, where only the parity of the number of crossings for each pair of independent edges is specified.

1 Introduction

A *topological graph* $T = (V(T), E(T))$ is a drawing of a graph G in the plane such that the vertices of G are represented by a set $V(T)$ of distinct points and the edges of G are represented by a set $E(T)$ of simple curves connecting the corresponding pairs of points. We call the elements of $V(T)$ and $E(T)$ the *vertices* and the *edges* of T , respectively. The drawing has to satisfy the following general position conditions: (1) the edges pass through no vertices except their endpoints, (2) every pair of edges has only a finite number of intersection points, (3) every intersection point of two edges is either a common endpoint or a proper crossing (“touching” of the edges is not allowed), and (4) no three edges pass through the same crossing. A topological graph or a drawing is *simple* if every pair of edges has at most one common point, which is either a common endpoint or a crossing. Simple topological graphs appear naturally as crossing-minimal drawings: it is well known that if two edges in a topological graph have more than one common point, then there is a local redrawing that decreases the

*The author was supported by Swiss National Science Foundation Grants 200021-137574 and 200020-144531, by the ESF Eurogiga project GraDR as GAČR GIG/11/E023, by the grant no. 14-14179S of the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) and by the grant GAUK 1262213 of the Grant Agency of Charles University. An extended abstract of this paper appeared in the proceedings of Graph Drawing 2015.

total number of crossings. A topological graph is *complete* if it is a drawing of a complete graph.

An *abstract topological graph* (briefly an *AT-graph*), a notion introduced by Kratochvíl, Lubiw and Nešetřil [14], is a pair $(G, \mathcal{X})$ where G is a graph and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \binom{E(G)}{2}$ is a set of pairs of its edges. Here we assume that $\mathcal{X}$ consists only of independent (that is, nonadjacent) pairs of edges. For a simple topological graph T that is a drawing of G , let $\mathcal{X}_T$ be the set of pairs of edges having a common crossing. A simple topological graph T is a *simple realization* of $(G, \mathcal{X})$ if $\mathcal{X}_T = \mathcal{X}$. We say that $(G, \mathcal{X})$ is *simply realizable* if $(G, \mathcal{X})$ has a simple realization.

An AT-graph $(H, \mathcal{Y})$ is an *AT-subgraph* of an AT-graph $(G, \mathcal{X})$ if H is a subgraph of G and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \cap \binom{E(H)}{2}$. Clearly, a simple realization of $(G, \mathcal{X})$ restricted to the vertices and edges of H is a simple realization of $(H, \mathcal{Y})$.

We are ready to state our main result.

Theorem 1. *Every complete AT-graph that is not simply realizable has an AT-subgraph on at most six vertices that is not simply realizable.*

We also show that AT-subgraphs with five vertices are not sufficient to characterize simple realizability.

Theorem 2. *There is a complete AT-graph A with six vertices such that all its complete AT-subgraphs with five vertices are simply realizable, but A itself is not.*

Theorems 1 and 2 are proved in Sections 4 and 3, respectively.

Theorem 1 implies a straightforward polynomial algorithm for simple realizability of complete AT-graphs, running in time $O(n^6)$ for graphs with n vertices. It is likely that this running time can be improved relatively easily. However, compared to the first polynomial algorithm for simple realizability of complete AT-graphs [17], the new algorithm may be more suitable for implementation and for practical applications, such as generating all simply realizable complete AT-graphs of given size or computing the crossing number of the complete graph [5, 20]. On the other hand, the new algorithm does not directly provide the drawing itself, unlike the original algorithm [17]. The explicit list of realizable AT-graphs on six vertices can be generated using the database of small simple complete topological graphs created by Ábrego et al. [1].

For general noncomplete graphs, no such finite characterization by forbidden AT-subgraphs is possible. Indeed, in the special case when $\mathcal{X}$ is empty, the problem of simple realizability is equivalent to planarity, and there are minimal nonplanar graphs of arbitrarily large girth; for example, subdivisions of K_5 . Moreover, simple realizability for general AT-graphs is NP-complete, even when the underlying graph is a matching [13, 15]. See [17] for an overview of other similar realizability problems.

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the polynomial algorithm for simple realizability of complete AT-graphs from [17]. The main idea is very simple: every time the algorithm rejects the input, it is due to an obstruction of constant size.

Theorem 1 is an analogue of a similar characterization of simple monotone drawings of K_n by forbidden 5-tuples, and pseudolinear drawings of K_n by forbidden 4-tuples [4].

Ábrego et al. [1, 2] independently verified that simple complete topological graphs with up to nine vertices can be characterized by forbidden rotation systems of five-vertex subgraphs; see Section 2 for the definition. They conjectured that the same characterization is true for all simple complete topological graphs [2]. This conjecture now follows by combining their

result for six-vertex graphs with Theorem 1. This gives a finite characterization of *realizable abstract rotation systems* defined in [18, Sect. 3.5], where it was also stated that such a characterization was not likely [18, p. 739]. The fact that only 5-tuples are sufficient for the characterization by rotation systems should perhaps not be too surprising, as rotation systems characterize simple drawings of K_n more economically, using only $O(n^2 \log n)$ bits, whereas AT-graphs need $\Theta(n^4)$ bits.

In Section 5 we show a construction of two simple curves related to the picture hanging puzzles studied by Demaine et al. [6], which could be of independent interest. The construction provides infinitely many irreducible configurations responsible for multiple crossings of two curves, using an arbitrary number of “nails” restricting the movement of the curves, and minimal in the sense that after removing an arbitrary nail, it is possible to eliminate all the crossings by a continuous deformation of the curves.

Independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability

A topological graph T is an *independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realization* of an AT-graph $(G, \mathcal{X})$ if $\mathcal{X}$ is the set of pairs of independent edges that cross an odd number of times in T . We say that $(G, \mathcal{X})$ is *independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable* if $(G, \mathcal{X})$ has an independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realization.

Clearly, every simple realization of an AT-graph is also its independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realization. The converse is not true, since every simple realization of K_4 has at most one crossing, but there are independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable AT-graphs $(K_4, \mathcal{X})$ with $|\mathcal{X}| = 2$ or $|\mathcal{X}| = 3$. Thus, independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability is only a necessary condition for simple realizability. However, independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability of arbitrary AT-graphs can be tested in polynomial time since it is equivalent to the solvability of a system of linear equations over $\mathbb{Z}_2$; see Section 6 for details.

Independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability has been usually considered only in the special case when $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$. In this case, for every graph G , the AT-graph $(G, \emptyset)$ has an independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realization if and only if $(G, \emptyset)$ has a simple realization, and this is equivalent to G being planar. This fact is known as the (strong) Hanani–Tutte theorem [9, 28]. A related concept, the *independent odd crossing number* of a graph G , $\text{iocr}(G)$, measuring the minimum cardinality of $\mathcal{X}$ for which $(G, \mathcal{X})$ has an independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realization, has been introduced by Székely [27]. The asymptotic value of $\text{iocr}(K_n)$ is not known, and computing $\text{iocr}(G)$ for a general graph G is NP-complete [21]. See Schaefer’s survey [25] for more information.

We call an AT-graph $(G, \mathcal{X})$ *even* (or an *even G*) if $|\mathcal{X}|$ is even, and *odd* (or an *odd G*) if $|\mathcal{X}|$ is odd. The following theorem is an analogue of Theorem 1 for independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability.

Theorem 3. *Every complete AT-graph that is not independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable has an AT-subgraph on at most six vertices that is not independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable. More precisely, a complete AT-graph is independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable if and only if it contains no even K_5 and no odd $2K_3$ as an AT-subgraph.*

Theorem 3 is proved in Section 6, where we also show that AT-subgraphs with five vertices are not sufficient to characterize independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable complete AT-graphs.

Theorem 3 again implies a straightforward algorithm for independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability of complete AT-graphs, running in time $O(n^6)$ for graphs with n vertices. This is slightly better compared to the algebraic algorithm, which essentially consists of solving a system of $\Theta(n^4)$ equations with $\Theta(n^3)$ variables; see Section 6. The algorithm by Jeannerod [12] solves such a

system in time $O(n^{3\omega+1})$, where $O(n^\omega)$ is the complexity of multiplication of two square $n \times n$ matrices. The best current algorithms for matrix multiplication give $\omega < 2.3729$ [19, 29].

2 Preliminaries

For a topological graph T and a subset $U \subseteq V(T)$, by $T[U]$ we denote the topological subgraph of T induced by U . Analogously, for an AT-graph $A = (G, \mathcal{X})$ and a subset $U \subseteq V(G)$, by $A[U]$ we denote the induced AT-subgraph $(G[U], \mathcal{X} \cap \binom{E(G[U])}{2})$.

A *face* of a topological graph T is a connected component of the set $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bigcup E(T)$.

Simple topological graphs G and H are *weakly isomorphic* if they are simple realizations of the same abstract topological graph. Topological graphs G and H are *isomorphic* if and only if there exists a homeomorphism of the sphere that transforms G into H .

The *rotation* of a vertex v in a topological graph is the clockwise cyclic order in which the edges incident with v leave the vertex v . The *rotation system* of a topological graph is the set of rotations of all its vertices. Similarly we define the *rotation* of a crossing x of edges uv and yz as the clockwise order in which the four parts xu, xv, xy and xz of the edges uv and yz leave the point x . Note that each crossing has exactly two possible rotations. We will represent the rotation of a vertex v as an ordered sequence of the other endpoints of the edges incident with v . Similarly, we will represent the rotation of a crossing x as an ordered sequence of the four endpoints of the edges incident with x .

The *extended rotation system* of a topological graph is the set of rotations of all its vertices and crossings.

Assuming that T and T' are drawings of the same abstract graph, we say that their rotation systems are *inverse* if for each vertex $v \in V(T)$, the rotation of v and the rotation of the corresponding vertex $v' \in V(T')$ are inverse cyclic permutations. If T and T' are weakly isomorphic simple topological graphs, we say that their extended rotation systems are *inverse* if their rotation systems are inverse and, in addition, for every crossing x in T , the rotation of x and the rotation of the corresponding crossing x' in T' are inverse cyclic permutations. For example, if T' is a mirror image of T , then T and T' have inverse extended rotation systems.

We say that two cyclic permutations of sets A, B are *compatible* if they are restrictions of a common cyclic permutation of $A \cup B$.

Simple complete topological graphs have the following key property.

Proposition 4. [8, 17]

- (1) *If two simple complete topological graphs are weakly isomorphic, then their extended rotation systems are either the same or inverse.*
- (2) *For every edge e of a simple complete topological graph T and for every pair of edges $f, f' \in E(T)$ that have a common endpoint and cross e , the AT-graph of T determines the order of crossings of e with the edges f, f' .*

By inspecting simple drawings of K_4 , it can be shown that the converse of Proposition 4 also holds: the rotation system of a simple complete topological graph determines which pairs of edges cross [16, 23].




Figure 1: Simple realizations of all six complete subgraphs of A with five vertices.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

We use the shortcut ij to denote the edge $\{i, j\}$. Let $A = ((V, E), \mathcal{X})$ be the complete AT-graph with vertex set $V = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and with

$$\mathcal{X} = \{\{02, 13\}, \{02, 14\}, \{02, 15\}, \{02, 35\}, \{03, 14\}, \{03, 15\}, \{03, 24\}, \{04, 15\}, \\ \{04, 25\}, \{04, 35\}, \{13, 24\}, \{24, 35\}, \{35, 14\}, \{14, 25\}, \{25, 13\}\}.$$

Every complete AT-subgraph of A with five vertices is simply realizable; see Figure 1.

Now we show that A is not simply realizable. Suppose that T is a simple realization of A . Without loss of generality, assume that the rotation of 5 in $T[\{1, 2, 3, 5\}]$ is $(1, 2, 3)$. By Proposition 4 and by the first drawing in Figure 1, the rotation of 5 in $T[\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}]$ is $(1, 2, 3, 4)$, since the inverse would not be compatible with $(1, 2, 3)$. Similarly, by the second drawing in Figure 1 the rotation of 5 in $T[\{0, 2, 3, 4, 5\}]$ is $(2, 3, 0, 4)$, since the inverse would not be compatible with $(1, 2, 3, 4)$. By the third drawing in Figure 1, the rotation of 5 in $T[\{0, 1, 3, 4, 5\}]$ is $(0, 1, 3, 4)$ or $(0, 4, 3, 1)$, but neither of them is compatible with both $(1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $(2, 3, 0, 4)$; a contradiction.

4 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $A = (K_n, \mathcal{X})$ be a given complete abstract topological graph with vertex set $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The algorithm from [17] for deciding simple realizability of A has the following three main steps: computing the rotation system, determining the homotopy class of every edge with respect to the edges incident with one chosen vertex v , and computing the number of crossings of every pair of edges in a crossing-optimal drawing with the rotation system and homotopy class fixed from the previous steps. We follow the algorithm and analyze each step in detail.

Step 1: computing the extended rotation system

This step is based on the proof of Proposition 4; see [17, Proposition 3].

1a) Realizability of 5-tuples

For every 5-tuple Q of vertices of A , the algorithm tests whether $A[Q]$ is simply realizable. If not, then the 5-tuple certifies that A is not simply realizable. If $A[Q]$ is simply realizable, then by Proposition 4, the algorithm computes a rotation system $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ such that the rotation system of every simple realization of $A[Q]$ is either $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ or the inverse of $\mathcal{R}(Q)$.




Figure 2: Triangulating a cycle in $\mathcal{G}$. The vertices in the first row represent the vertices $F_1, \dots, F_i$ of the original cycle $\mathcal{K}$, the vertices in the second row represent the vertices $F'_2, \dots, F'_{i-2}$.

1b) Orienting 5-tuples

For every 5-tuple $Q \subseteq [n]$, the algorithm selects an orientation $\Phi(\mathcal{R}(Q))$ of $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ so that for every pair of 5-tuples $Q, Q' \subseteq [n]$ having four common vertices and for each $x \in Q \cap Q'$, the rotations of x in $\Phi(\mathcal{R}(Q))$ and $\Phi(\mathcal{R}(Q'))$ are compatible. If there is no such orientation map Φ , the AT-graph A is not simply realizable. We show that in this case there is a set S of six vertices of A that certifies this.

Let Q_1, Q_2 be two 5-tuples with four common elements, let $\mathcal{R}_1$ be a rotation system on Q_1 and let $\mathcal{R}_2$ be a rotation system on Q_2 . We say that $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ are *compatible* if for every $x \in Q_1 \cap Q_2$, the rotations of x in $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ are compatible.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the graph with vertex set $\binom{[n]}{5}$ and edge set consisting of those pairs $\{Q, Q'\}$ whose intersection has size 4. For every edge $\{Q, Q'\}$ of $\mathcal{G}$, at most one orientation of $\mathcal{R}(Q')$ is compatible with $\mathcal{R}(Q)$. If no orientation of $\mathcal{R}(Q')$ is compatible with $\mathcal{R}(Q)$, then the 6-tuple $S = Q \cup Q'$ certifies that A is not simply realizable. We may thus assume that for every edge $\{Q, Q'\}$ of $\mathcal{G}$, exactly one orientation of $\mathcal{R}(Q')$ is compatible with $\mathcal{R}(Q)$. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the set of those edges $\{Q, Q'\}$ of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ and $\mathcal{R}(Q')$ are not compatible.

Call a set $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{5}$ *orientable* if there is an orientation map Φ assigning to every rotation system $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ with $Q \in \mathcal{W}$ either $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ itself or its inverse $(\mathcal{R}(Q))^{-1}$, such that for every pair of 5-tuples $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{W}$ with $|Q \cap Q'| = 4$, the rotation systems $\Phi(\mathcal{R}(Q))$ and $\Phi(\mathcal{R}(Q'))$ are compatible.

Lemma 5. *If $\binom{[n]}{5}$ is not orientable, then there is a 6-tuple $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $\binom{S}{5}$ is not orientable.*

Proof. Clearly, $\binom{[n]}{5}$ is not orientable if and only if $\mathcal{G}$ has a cycle with an odd number of edges from $\mathcal{E}$. Call such a cycle a *nonorientable* cycle. We claim that if $\mathcal{G}$ has a nonorientable cycle, then $\mathcal{G}$ has a nonorientable triangle. Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ be the cycle space of $\mathcal{G}$. The parity of the number of edges of $\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ is a linear form on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$. Hence, to prove our claim, it is sufficient to show that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by triangles.

Suppose that $\mathcal{K} = F_1 F_2 \dots F_k$, with $k \geq 4$, is a shortest cycle in $\mathcal{G}$ that is not a sum of triangles in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$. Then $\mathcal{K}$ is an induced cycle in $\mathcal{G}$, that is, $|F_i \cap F_j| \leq 3$ if $2 \leq |i - j| \leq k - 2$. Let $z \in F_1 \setminus F_2$. Then $z \in F_k$, otherwise $|F_k \cap F_1 \cap F_2| = 4$. Let i be the smallest index such that $i \geq 3$ and $z \in F_i$. We have $i \geq 4$, otherwise $|F_1 \cap F_3| = |(F_1 \cap F_2 \cap F_3) \cup \{z\}| = 4$. For every $j \in \{2, \dots, i - 2\}$, let $F'_j = (F_j \cap F_{j+1}) \cup \{z\}$. Then $\mathcal{K}$ is the sum of the closed walk $\mathcal{K}' = F_1 F'_2 \dots F'_{i-2} F_i \dots F_k$ and the triangles $F_1 F_2 F'_2, F_{i-1} F_i F'_{i-2}, F_j F_{j+1} F'_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, i - 2$ and $F_{j+1} F'_j F'_{j+1}$ for $j = 2, \dots, i - 3$; see Figure 2. Since the length of $\mathcal{K}'$ is $k - 1$, we have a contradiction with the choice of $\mathcal{K}$.

Let $Q_1 Q_2 Q_3$ be a nonorientable triangle in $\mathcal{G}$. The 5-tuples Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 have either three or four common elements. Suppose that $|Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap Q_3| = 4$ and let $\{u, v, w, z\} = Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap Q_3$.

Then we may orient the rotation systems $\mathcal{R}(Q_1), \mathcal{R}(Q_2)$ and $\mathcal{R}(Q_3)$ so that the rotation of u in each of the orientations is compatible with (v, w, z) . This implies that the rotations of u in the resulting rotation systems are pairwise compatible. Thus, the resulting rotation systems are pairwise compatible, a contradiction. Hence, we have $|Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap Q_3| = 3$, which implies that $|Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup Q_3| = 6$. Setting $S = Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup Q_3$, the set $\binom{S}{5}$ is not orientable. $\square$

If $\binom{[n]}{5}$ is orientable, there are exactly two possible solutions for the orientation map. We will assume that the rotation of 1 in $\Phi(\mathcal{R}(\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}))$ is compatible with $(2, 3, 4)$, so that there is at most one solution Φ .

1c) Computing the rotations of vertices

Having oriented the rotation system of every 5-tuple, the algorithm now computes the rotation of every $x \in [n]$, as the cyclic permutation compatible with the rotation of x in every $\Phi(\mathcal{R}(Q))$ such that $x \in Q \in \binom{[n]}{5}$. We show that this is always possible.

Lemma 6. *Let $k \geq 4$. For every $F \in \binom{[k+1]}{k}$, let π_F be a cyclic permutation of F such that for every pair $F, F' \in \binom{[k+1]}{k}$, the cyclic permutations π_F and $\pi_{F'}$ are compatible. Then there is a cyclic permutation $\pi_{[k+1]}$ of $[k+1]$ compatible with all the cyclic permutations π_F with $F \in \binom{[k+1]}{k}$.*

Proof. We may assume that $\pi_{[k]} = (1, 2, \dots, k)$. For $i \in [k]$, let $F_i = [k+1] \setminus \{i\}$. Since $F_i \cap [k] = [k] \setminus \{i\}$, the cyclic permutation π_{F_i} is compatible with $(1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, k)$. The only freedom is thus in the position of the element $k+1$. Since π_{F_1} and π_{F_3} are compatible and $k \geq 4$, it is not possible that $\pi_{F_1} = (k+1, 2, 3, 4, \dots, k)$ and $\pi_{F_3} = (1, 2, k+1, 4, \dots, k)$ simultaneously. Hence, in at least one of the cyclic permutations π_{F_1}, π_{F_3} , the position of $k+1$ is between two adjacent elements $i, i+1$ of the cycle $(1, 2, \dots, k)$ (counting mod k). From the compatibility condition, all the other permutations π_j are now uniquely determined and they are all compatible with the cyclic permutation $(1, 2, \dots, i, k+1, i+1, \dots, k)$. $\square$

Let $x \in [n]$. For every $F \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{x\}}{4}$, let π_F be the rotation of x in $\Phi(\mathcal{R}(F \cup \{x\}))$. For every pair $F, F' \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{x\}}{4}$ with $|F \cap F'| = 3$, the cyclic permutations π_F and $\pi_{F'}$ are compatible. Let $k \geq 4$ and suppose that for every $F \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{x\}}{k}$, we have a cyclic permutation π_F of F such that for every pair $F, F' \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{x\}}{k}$ with $|F \cap F'| = k-1$, the cyclic permutations π_F and $\pi_{F'}$ are compatible. By Lemma 6, for every $Q \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{x\}}{k+1}$ there is a cyclic permutation π_Q compatible with every π_F such that $F \in \binom{Q}{k}$. Moreover, for every pair $Q, Q' \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{x\}}{k+1}$ with $|Q \cap Q'| = k$, the cyclic permutations π_Q and $\pi_{Q'}$ are compatible since they are both compatible with $\pi_{Q \cap Q'}$. By induction, there is a cyclic permutation of $[n] \setminus \{x\}$ that is compatible with every π_F such that $F \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{x\}}{4}$. This cyclic permutation is the rotation of x .

1d) Computing the rotations of crossings

For every pair of edges $\{\{u, v\}, \{x, y\}\} \in \mathcal{X}$, the algorithm determines the rotation of their crossing from the rotations of the vertices u, v, x, y . This finishes the computation of the extended rotation system.

Step 2: determining the homotopy classes of the edges

Let v be a fixed vertex of A and let $S(v)$ be a topological star consisting of v and all the edges incident with v , drawn in the plane so that the rotation of v agrees with the rotation computed in the previous step. For every edge $e = xy$ of A not incident with v , the algorithm computes the order of crossings of e with the subset $E_{v,e}$ of edges of $S(v)$ that e has to cross. By Proposition 4 (2), the five-vertex AT-subgraphs of A determine the relative order of crossings of e with every pair of edges of $E_{v,e}$. Define a binary relation $\prec_{x,y}$ on $E_{v,e}$ so that $vu \prec_{x,y} vw$ if the crossing of e with vu is closer to x than the crossing of e with vw . If $\prec_{x,y}$ is acyclic, it defines a total order of crossings of e with the edges of $E_{v,e}$. If $\prec_{x,y}$ has a cycle, then it also has an oriented triangle vu_1, vu_2, vu_3 . This means that the AT-subgraph of A induced by the six vertices v, u_1, u_2, u_3, x, y is not simply realizable.

We recall that the *homotopy class* of a curve φ in a surface Σ relative to the boundary of Σ is the set of all curves that can be obtained from φ by a continuous deformation within Σ , keeping the boundary of Σ fixed pointwise.

We define the *homotopy class of e* using the following combinatorial data: the set $E_{v,e}$, the total order $\prec_{x,y}$ in which the edges of $E_{v,e}$ cross e , the rotations of these crossings, and the rotations of the vertices x and y . Consider the star $S(v)$ drawn on the sphere. Cut circular holes around the points representing all the vertices except v , and let Σ be the resulting surface with boundary. Let x_e and y_e be fixed points on the boundaries of the two holes around x and y , respectively, so that the orders of these points corresponding to all the edges of A on the boundaries of the holes agree with the computed rotation system. Draw a curve φ_e with endpoints x_e and y_e satisfying all the combinatorial data of e . Now the homotopy class of e is defined as the homotopy class of φ_e in Σ relative to the boundary of Σ .

Step 3: computing the minimum crossing numbers

For every pair of edges e, f , let $\text{cr}(e, f)$ be the minimum possible number of crossings of two curves from the homotopy classes of e and f . Similarly, let $\text{cr}(e)$ be the minimum possible number of self-crossings of a curve from the homotopy class of e . The numbers $\text{cr}(e, f)$ and $\text{cr}(e)$ can be computed in polynomial time in any 2-dimensional surface with boundary [3, 26]. In our special case, the algorithm is relatively straightforward [17].

We use the key fact that from the homotopy class of every edge, it is possible to choose a representative such that the crossing numbers $\text{cr}(e, f)$ and $\text{cr}(e)$ are all realized simultaneously [17]. This is a consequence of the following facts.

Lemma 7. [11] *Let γ be a curve on an orientable surface S with endpoints on the boundary of S that has more self-intersections than required by its homotopy class. Then there is a singular 1-gon or a singular 2-gon bounded by parts of γ .*

Here a *singular 1-gon* of a curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow S$ is an image $\gamma[\alpha]$ of an interval $\alpha \subset [0, 1]$ such that γ identifies the endpoints of α and the resulting loop is contractible in S . A *singular 2-gon* of γ is an image of two disjoint intervals $\alpha, \beta \subset [0, 1]$ such that γ identifies the endpoints of α with the endpoints of β and the resulting loop is contractible in S .

Lemma 8. [7, 11] *Let C_1 and C_2 be two simple curves on a surface S such that the endpoints of C_1 and C_2 lie on the boundary of S . If C_1 and C_2 have more intersections than required by their homotopy classes, then there is an innermost embedded 2-gon between C_1 and C_2 , that is, two subarcs of C_1 and C_2 bounding a disc in S whose interior is disjoint with C_1 and C_2 .*




Figure 3: A drawing of a “typical” edge $w_a w_b$ and the star $S(v)$.

Whenever there is a singular 1-gon, a singular 2-gon, or an innermost embedded 2-gon in a system of curves on S , it is possible to eliminate the 1-gon or 2-gon by a homotopy of the corresponding curves, which decreases the total number of crossings.

For the rest of the proof, we fix a drawing D of A such that its rotation system is the same as the rotation system computed in Step 1, the edges of $S(v)$ do not cross each other, every other edge is drawn as a curve in its homotopy class computed in Step 2, and under these conditions, the total number of crossings is the minimum possible. Then every edge f of $S(v)$ crosses every other edge e at most once, and this happens exactly if $\{e, f\} \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, for every pair of edges e_1, e_2 not incident with v , the corresponding curves in D cross exactly $\text{cr}(e_1, e_2)$ times, and the curve representing e_1 has $\text{cr}(e_1)$ self-crossings. Hence, A is simply realizable if and only if all the edges e_1, e_2 not incident with v satisfy $\text{cr}(e_1) = 0$, $\text{cr}(e_1, e_2) \leq 1$, and $\text{cr}(e_1, e_2) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \{e_1, e_2\} \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, if A is simply realizable, then D is a simple realization of A .

3a) Characterization of the homotopy classes

Let $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{n-1}$ be the vertices of A adjacent to v and assume that the rotation of v is $(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{n-1})$. Let $w_a w_b$ be an edge such that $1 \leq a < b \leq n - 1$. Since every AT-subgraph of A with four or five vertices is simply realizable, we have the following conditions on the homotopy class of $w_a w_b$. Refer to Figure 3.

Observation 9. *Suppose that $\{w_a w_b, v w_c\} \in \mathcal{X}$; that is, $v w_c \in E_{v, w_a w_b}$. If $a < c < b$, then the rotation of the crossing of $w_a w_b$ with $v w_c$ is (w_a, w_c, w_b, v) . If $c < a$ or $b < c$, then the rotation of the crossing is (w_b, w_c, w_a, v) . $\square$*

Observation 9 implies that the homotopy class of the edge $w_a w_b$ is determined by a permutation of $E_{v, w_a w_b}$ that determines the order in which $w_a w_b$ crosses the edges in $E_{v, w_a w_b}$. The next observation further restricts this permutation.

Observation 10. *Suppose that $v w_c, v w_d \in E_{v, w_a w_b}$. If $a < c < d < b$, then $v w_c \prec_{w_a w_b} v w_d$. If (c, d, a, b) is compatible with $(1, 2, \dots, n - 1)$ as cyclic permutations, then $v w_d \prec_{w_a w_b} v w_c$. $\square$*

On the other hand, it is easy to see that every homotopy class satisfying Observations 9 and 10 has a representative that is a simple curve. Therefore, $\text{cr}(w_a w_b) = 0$. Let $\gamma_{a,b}$ be the simple curve representing the edge $w_a w_b$ in D .

3b) The parity of the crossing numbers

Observation 11. *Let $w_a w_b$ and $w_c w_d$ be two independent edges. Then $\text{cr}(w_a w_b, w_c w_d)$ is odd if and only if $\{w_a w_b, w_c w_d\} \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. Each of the triangles $vw_a w_b$ and $vw_c w_d$ is represented by a simple closed curve in D , so the total number of crossings of the two curves is even. The crossings include the vertex v if (w_a, w_c, w_b, w_d) , (w_a, w_d, w_b, w_c) , or the inverse of one of these two cyclic permutations is compatible with the rotation of v . The following pairs of edges may cross once in D : $\{w_a w_b, vw_c\}$, $\{w_a w_b, vw_d\}$, $\{w_c w_d, vw_a\}$, $\{w_c w_d, vw_b\}$. Each of these five crossings appears in D if and only if it appears in a topological graph T that is a simple realization of the induced AT-graph $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d\}]$. The remaining crossings between the two triangles $vw_a w_b$ and $vw_c w_d$ in D may appear only between the arcs $\gamma_{a,b}$ and $\gamma_{c,d}$. Since the corresponding triangles $vw_a w_b$ and $vw_c w_d$ in T also have an even number of crossing in total, the parity of the number of crossings between $\gamma_{a,b}$ and $\gamma_{c,d}$ is odd if and only if $w_a w_b$ and $w_c w_d$ cross in T . The observation follows. $\square$

Observation 12. *Let $w_a w_b$ and $w_a w_c$ be two adjacent edges. Then $\text{cr}(w_a w_b, w_a w_c)$ is even.*

Proof. The triangle $vw_a w_b$ is represented by a simple closed curve γ in D , and the path $vw_c w_a$ is represented by a simple arc α . The rotations at v and w_a determine whether the end-pieces of α are attached to γ from inside or outside. The following two pairs of edges can cross once in D : $\{w_a w_b, vw_c\}$ and $\{w_a w_c, vw_b\}$. Each of these crossings appears in D if and only if it appears in a simple realization T of $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c\}]$. The remaining crossings between the curves γ and α in D may appear only between the arcs $\gamma_{a,b}$ and $\gamma_{a,c}$. The end-pieces of α are both attached to γ from the same side if and only if in T , the end-pieces of the path $vw_c w_a$ are attached to the triangle $vw_a w_b$ from the same side. Therefore, the parity of the total number of crossings between γ and α is even if and only if the path $vw_c w_a$ crosses the triangle $vw_a w_b$ an even number of times in T , which happens if and only if T is planar. The parity of the number of crossings between $\gamma_{a,b}$ and $\gamma_{a,c}$ is thus equal to the parity of the number of crossings between $w_a w_b$ and $w_a w_c$ in T . Since $w_a w_b$ and $w_a w_c$ do not cross in T , the observation follows. $\square$

Observations 11 and 12 imply that A is realizable if and only if every pair of edges in D crosses at most once.

3c) Multiple crossings of adjacent edges

We show that adjacent edges do not cross in D , otherwise some AT-subgraph of A with five vertices is not simply realizable. Let $w_a w_b$ and $w_a w_c$ be two adjacent edges. By symmetry, we may assume that $a < b < c$. We will consider cyclic intervals (a, b) , (b, c) and $(c, a) = (c, n-1] \cup [1, a)$. We define the following subsets of $E_{v, w_a w_b}$ and $E_{v, w_a w_c}$. For each of the three cyclic intervals (i, j) , let $F_b(i, j) = \{vw_k \in E_{v, w_a w_b}; k \in (i, j)\}$ and $F_c(i, j) = \{vw_k \in E_{v, w_a w_c}; k \in (i, j)\}$. We will also write $\prec_b$ as a shortcut for $\prec_{w_a w_b}$ and $\prec_c$ as a shortcut for $\prec_{w_a w_c}$. By symmetry, we have two general cases.

I) $w_a w_b$ does not cross vw_c and $w_a w_c$ does not cross vw_b . In this case, the rotation of w_a is compatible with (v, w_c, w_b) . We observe the following conditions.




Figure 4: Left: illustration to Observation 13. Right: illustration to Observation 14.




Figure 5: Left: illustration to Observation 15. Right: illustration to Observation 16.

Observation 13. We have $F_b(c, a) \subseteq F_c(c, a)$ and $F_c(a, b) \subseteq F_b(a, b)$.

Proof. We prove the first inclusion, the second one follows by symmetry. Let $d \in (c, a)$ such that $w_a w_b$ crosses vw_d . Let T be a simple realization of $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d\}]$. Refer to Figure 4, left. Clearly, $w_a w_c$ is forced to cross vw_d in T . $\square$

Observation 14. The sets $F_b(b, c)$ and $F_c(b, c)$ are disjoint.

Proof. Let $d \in (b, c)$ such that $w_a w_b$ crosses vw_d . Let T be a simple realization of $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d\}]$. Refer to Figure 4, right. Since $w_a w_c$ is adjacent to vw_a and $w_a w_b$, it cannot cross the closed curve formed by vw_a and parts of the edges $w_a w_b$ and vw_d . Therefore, $w_a w_c$ cannot cross vw_d . $\square$

Observation 15. If $vw_d \in F_b(b, c)$ and $vw_e \in F_c(b, c)$, then $d < e$.

Proof. Let $d, e \in (b, c)$ such that $vw_d \in F_b(b, c)$ and $vw_e \in F_c(b, c)$. Observation 14 implies that $d \neq e$. If $e < d$ then $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is not simply realizable. See Figure 5, left. More precisely, if $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then the edges $w_a w_d$ and vw_e do not cross and the rotation of w_a is compatible with (w_c, w_b, w_d, v) . If also $A[\{v, w_a, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then $w_a w_d$ and vw_e cross; a contradiction. $\square$

Observation 16. Let $vw_d \in F_b(a, b) \cap F_c(a, b)$ and $vw_e \in F_b(c, a) \cap F_c(c, a)$. Then $vw_d \prec_b vw_e \Leftrightarrow vw_d \prec_c vw_e$.

Proof. Suppose that $vw_d \prec_b vw_e$ and $vw_e \prec_c vw_d$. Then $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is not simply realizable. See Figure 5, right. More precisely, if $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then the edges $w_a w_e$ and vw_d cross and the rotation of w_a is compatible with (w_c, w_b, w_e, v) . If also $A[\{v, w_a, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then $w_a w_e$ and vw_d do not cross. $\square$




Figure 6: Left: Illustration to Observation 17. Right: A drawing of the edges $w_a w_b$, $w_a w_c$ and parts of edges of $S(v)$ in case I), where $w_a w_b$ and $w_a w_c$ do not cross. The rotation of v is compatible with the counterclockwise cyclic order of the parts of the edges drawn.

Observation 17. *Let $vw_d \in F_c(a, b)$ and $vw_e \in F_b(b, c)$. Then $vw_d \prec_b vw_e$. Similarly, if $vw_d \in F_b(c, a)$ and $vw_e \in F_c(b, c)$, then $vw_d \prec_c vw_e$.*

Proof. We show the first part, the second part follows by symmetry. Observation 13 implies that $vw_d \in F_b(a, b)$ and Observation 14 implies that $vw_e \notin F_c(b, c)$. Suppose that $vw_e \prec_b vw_d$. Then $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is not simply realizable. See Figure 6, left. More precisely, if $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then the edges $w_a w_e$ and vw_d do not cross and the rotation of w_a is compatible with (w_c, w_b, w_e, v) . If also $A[\{v, w_a, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then $w_a w_e$ and vw_d cross. $\square$

We show that Observations 13–17 imply that $\text{cr}(w_a w_b, w_a w_c) = 0$. Refer to Figure 6, right. Start with drawing the edges $w_a w_b$ and $w_a w_c$ without crossing. Observations 14 and 16 imply that there is a total order $\prec$ on $E_{v, w_a w_b} \cup E_{v, w_a w_c}$ that is a common extension of $\prec_b$ and $\prec_c$. Let vw_i be the $\prec$ -largest element of $F_b(c, a) \cup F_c(a, b)$. Observation 17 implies that all edges vw_j from $F_b(b, c) \cup F_c(b, c)$ satisfy $vw_i \prec vw_j$. Observation 13 implies that we can draw the edges vw_j with $vw_j \preceq vw_i$ like in the figure. Observations 14, 15 and 17 imply that we can draw the edges vw_j with $vw_i \prec vw_j$ like in the figure. The remaining edges of $S(v)$ can be drawn easily. In this way we obtain a simple drawing with noncrossing representatives of the homotopy classes of $w_a w_b$ and $w_a w_c$.

II) $w_a w_b$ does not cross vw_c and $w_a w_c$ crosses vw_b . In this case, the rotation of w_a is compatible with (v, w_b, w_c) . Let x be the crossing of $w_a w_c$ and vw_b . For each of the three cyclic intervals (i, j) with endpoints a, b or c , let $F_{w_a x}(i, j)$ be the set of edges vw_k such that the part $w_a x$ of $w_a w_c$ crosses vw_k and $k \in (i, j)$. Similarly, let $F_{x w_c}(i, j)$ be the set of edges vw_k such that the part $x w_c$ of $w_a w_c$ crosses vw_k and $k \in (i, j)$. Clearly, $F_c(i, j) = F_{w_a x}(i, j) \cup F_{x w_c}(i, j)$. We observe the following conditions.

Observation 18. *We have $F_b(a, b) \subseteq F_{w_a x}(a, b)$.*

Proof. Let $d \in (a, b)$ such that $w_a w_b$ crosses vw_d . Let T be a simple realization of $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d\}]$. Refer to Figure 7, left. Clearly, $w_a x$ is forced to cross vw_d in T . $\square$

Observation 19. *We have $F_{w_a x}(c, a) \subseteq F_b(c, a)$.*




Figure 7: Left: Illustration to Observation 18. Middle: Illustration to Observation 19. Right: Illustration to Observation 20.




Figure 8: Left: Illustration to Observation 20. The edge $w_a w_b$ is forced to cross vw_d and hence also $w_a w_c$. Right: Illustration to Observation 21.

Proof. Let $d \in (c, a)$ such that $w_a x$ crosses vw_d . Let T be a simple realization of $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d\}]$. Refer to Figure 7, middle. Clearly, $w_a w_b$ is forced to cross vw_d in T . $\square$

Observation 20. Let $d, e \in (c, a)$ such that $vw_d \in F_{xw_c}(c, a)$ and $vw_e \in F_b(c, a)$. Then $d \neq e$ and (d, e, a) is compatible with $(1, 2, \dots, n-1)$.

Proof. If $d = e$, then $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d\}]$ is not simply realizable; see Figure 7, right. Suppose that $d \neq e$, (e, d, a) is compatible with $(1, 2, \dots, n-1)$ and $vw_d \notin F_b(c, a)$. Then $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is not simply realizable. Refer to Figure 8, left. More precisely, if $A[\{v, w_a, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then the edges $w_a w_d$ and vw_e do not cross and the rotation of w_a is compatible with (w_b, w_c, w_d, v) . If also $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then $w_a w_d$ and vw_e cross. $\square$

Observation 21. We have $F_b(b, c) \subseteq F_{xw_c}(b, c)$.

Proof. Let $d \in (b, c)$ such that $w_a w_b$ crosses vw_d . Let T be a simple realization of $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d\}]$. Refer to Figure 8, right. Clearly, xw_c is forced to cross vw_d in T . $\square$

Observation 22. Let $vw_d \in F_b(a, b) \cap F_{w_a x}(a, b)$ and $vw_e \in F_b(c, a) \cap F_{w_a x}(c, a)$. Then $vw_d \prec_b vw_e \Leftrightarrow vw_d \prec_c vw_e$.

Proof. If $vw_d \prec_c vw_e$ and $vw_e \prec_b vw_d$, then $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is not simply realizable. See Figure 9, left. More precisely, if $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then the edges $w_a w_e$ and vw_d do not cross and the rotation of w_a is compatible with (w_b, w_c, w_e, v) . If also $A[\{v, w_a, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then $w_a w_e$ and vw_d cross.

If $vw_e \prec_c vw_d$ and $vw_d \prec_b vw_e$, then $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is not simply realizable. See Figure 9, right. More precisely, if $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then the edges




Figure 9: Illustrations to Observation 22.




Figure 10: Left: Illustration to Observation 23. Right: A drawing of the edges w_aw_b , w_aw_c and parts of the edges of $S(v)$ in case II), where w_aw_b and w_aw_c do not cross. The rotation of v is compatible with the counterclockwise cyclic order of the parts of the edges drawn.

w_aw_e and vw_d cross and the rotation of w_a is compatible with (w_b, w_c, w_e, v) . If also $A[\{v, w_a, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then w_aw_e and vw_d do not cross. $\square$

Observation 23. Let $vw_d \in F_b(b, c) \cap F_{w_ax}(b, c)$ and $vw_e \in F_{xw_c}(c, a)$. Then $vw_d \prec_c vw_e$.

Proof. Suppose that $vw_e \prec_c vw_d$. Then $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is not simply realizable. See Figure 10, left. More precisely, if $A[\{v, w_a, w_b, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then the edges w_aw_d and vw_e do not cross and the rotation of w_a is compatible with (w_b, w_d, w_c, v) . If also $A[\{v, w_a, w_c, w_d, w_e\}]$ is simply realizable then w_aw_d and vw_e cross. $\square$

We show that Observations 18–23 imply that $\text{cr}(w_aw_b, w_aw_c) = 0$. Refer to Figure 10, right. Start with drawing the edges w_aw_b and w_aw_c without crossing and so that w_aw_c crosses vw_b from the left; that is, so that the rotation of the crossing is (w_a, w_b, w_c, v) .

Observation 22 implies that there is a total order $\prec'$ on $F_{w_ax}(a, b) \cup F_{w_ax}(c, a) \cup E_{v, w_aw_b}$ that is a common extension of $\prec_b$ and $\prec_c$. By Observation 10, there is also a total order $\prec''$ on $F_{xw_c}(b, c) \cup F_{xw_c}(c, a) \cup E_{v, w_aw_b}$ that is a common extension of $\prec_c$ and the inverse of $\prec_b$. Let vw_j be the $\prec''$ -smallest element of $F_{xw_c}(c, a)$. Observations 18 and 19 imply that we can draw the edges of $F_{w_ax}(a, b) \cup F_{w_ax}(c, a) \cup F_b(a, b) \cup F_b(c, a)$ like in the figure. Observation 21 implies that we can draw the edges of $F_{xw_c}(b, c) \cup F_b(b, c)$ like in the figure. Observation 20 implies that the edges of $F_b(c, a)$ are separated from the edges of $F_{xw_c}(c, a)$ in the rotation of v , and Observation 23 implies that all edges $vw_k \in F_b(b, c)$ satisfy $vw_k \prec'' vw_j$, therefore we can draw the edges of $F_{xw_c}(c, a)$ like in the figure.




Figure 11: Four types of bigons between e and f . An ij -bigon is denoted by B_{ij} .

3d) Detecting multiple crossings of independent edges

There are several possible approaches to finding small obstructions in the case when independent edges cross more than once. By the analysis in [17], if two independent edges e, f cross at least twice, then a subset of at most 13 vertices is responsible: this includes the vertex v , the endpoints of e and f , and at most four more vertices for each crossing.

We could proceed analogously as in the previous substep, by investigating drawings of a graph consisting of the star $S(v)$ and two additional independent edges e, f . We would show that if the homotopy classes of e, f force the two edges to cross at least twice, then it is typically due to a subgraph with seven vertices. However, this would lead to a rather tedious case analysis.

Therefore, we choose another approach. We use the fact that D is a drawing of a complete graph and that adjacent edges do not cross in D , which is guaranteed by the results of the previous step. We proceed by induction. Whenever we have two independent edges that cross at least twice, we either find a drawing of a forbidden subgraph with just five vertices, or another pair of independent edges that cross at least twice, but in a smaller subgraph. Now we make the idea more precise.

Let $e = w_a w_b$ and $f = w_c w_d$ be two independent edges that cross more than once in D . In the subgraph of D formed by the two edges e and f , the vertices w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d are incident to a common face, since adjacent edges do not cross in D and every pair of the four vertices w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d is connected by an edge. We assume without loss of generality that w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d are incident to the outer face. That is, we may draw a simple closed curve γ containing the vertices w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d but no interior points of e or f , such that the relative interiors of e and f are inside γ .

Suppose that e and f cross an even number of times. The edge e splits the region inside γ into two regions, $R_0(e)$ and $R_1(e)$, where $R_0(e)$ is the region that does not contain the endpoints of f on its boundary. Similarly, f splits the region inside γ into regions $R_0(f)$ and $R_1(f)$ where $R_0(f)$ is the region that does not contain the endpoints of e on its boundary.

By Lemma 8, there is an innermost embedded 2-gon between e and f . For brevity, we call an innermost embedded 2-gon shortly a *bigon*. For a bigon B , by B^o we denote the open region inside B and we call it the *inside* of B . There are four possible types of bigons between e and f , according to the regions $R_i(e)$ and $R_j(f)$ in which their insides are contained. For $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, we call a bigon B an ij -bigon if $B^o \subseteq R_i(e) \cap R_j(f)$; see Figure 11.

Since D is a drawing realizing the crossing number $\text{cr}(e, f)$, there is at least one vertex of D inside every bigon. The graph induced by v , the endpoints of e and f , and a set of




Figure 12: The vertices w_i and w_d are on opposite sides of the curve γ_{abc} .

vertices intersecting all bigons, certifies that e and f have at least $\text{cr}(e, f)$ crossings forced by their homotopy classes. In Section 5 we show that it is not always possible to find only a bounded number of vertices inside bigons that would force at least one crossing of e with f , if the homotopy classes of e and f do not necessarily have representatives crossing every edge of the star $S(v)$ at most once.

Observation 24. *Let D' be a drawing of K_5 that is a subdrawing of D . For every vertex v of D' , there is an edge vw in D' that crosses every other edge in D' an even number of times.*

Proof. By Observations 11 and 12, it is sufficient to show that in simple drawings of K_5 , it is not possible that for some vertex v all four edges incident with v have a crossing. If there was such a vertex, there would have to be five crossings in total. Up to isomorphism, there are two different simple drawings of K_5 with five crossings [10]; see, for example, the first two drawings in Figure 1. Clearly, all vertices in these two drawings satisfy the claim. $\square$

Lemma 25. *If e and f cross evenly and there is a 00-bigon B between e and f in D , then there is a vertex w_i inside B , and the AT-subgraph of A induced by the 5-tuple $Q = \{w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_i\}$ is not simply realizable.*

Proof. Consider a subdrawing D' of D formed by the edges $e, f, w_a w_c$ and $w_b w_c$; see Figure 12. Since adjacent edges do not cross in D , the only crossings in D' are those between e and f . In particular, the triangle $w_a w_b w_c$ is a simple closed curve; call it γ_{abc} . Since $w_i \in R_0(e)$, w_d is outside $R_0(e)$, and the edge f crosses the curve γ_{abc} only on e , it follows that w_i and w_d are on opposite sides of γ_{abc} . In particular, the edge $w_i w_d$ has to cross some edge of the triangle $w_a w_b w_c$ an odd number of times. By symmetry, in the subgraph induced by Q , every edge adjacent to w_i crosses some other edge an odd number of times. This is in contradiction with Observation 24. $\square$

Observation 26. *If e and f cross evenly and at least twice in D , and there is no 00-bigon between e and f , then there is a 01-bigon and a 10-bigon between e and f .*

Proof. If there is no 00-bigon and no 01-bigon between e and f , then there is no bigon in the region $R_0(e)$, so e and f have no crossings. $\square$

Now we define crossing numbers of edges *relative* to a subset of vertices. For a subset W of vertices of A containing v and the endpoints of two edges e and f , let $\text{cr}_W(e, f)$ be the minimum possible number of crossings of two curves from the homotopy classes of e and f




Figure 13: Three disjoint bigons between f and parts of the edges of the triangle $w_a w_b w_i$ yield a plane drawing of $K_{3,3}$.

determined by $A[W]$, by a procedure analogous to the one in Step 2. That is, if we start with the subdrawing of D consisting of the vertices of W and the edges e and f , and simplify it sequentially by removing all bigons with no vertices of W inside them, we get a drawing where e and f cross $\text{cr}_W(e, f)$ times.

The following lemma proves the induction step in the case when e and f cross an even number of times.

Lemma 27. *If e and f cross evenly and at least twice in D , and there is no 00-bigon between e and f , then there is a proper subset W of vertices of A and an edge g independent from f such that $\text{cr}_W(g, f) \geq 2$.*

Proof. By Observation 26, there is a 01-bigon B between e and f . Let w_i be a vertex inside B . Let W' be a minimal subset of vertices containing $v, w_a, w_b, w_c, w_d, w_i$ and at least one vertex inside every bigon between e and f (except B). By the definition of W' , we have $\text{cr}_{W'}(e, f) = \text{cr}(e, f)$. We may assume that W' is the vertex set of A , otherwise we just take $g = e$. The edges $w_a w_i$ and $w_b w_i$ are adjacent to e and thus do not cross e . Moreover, in the drawing induced by e and f , the vertices w_a and w_b are separated from w_i by at least two parts of f connecting points on e . This implies that $\text{cr}_{W'}(w_a w_i, f) \geq 2$ and $\text{cr}_{W'}(w_b w_i, f) \geq 2$.

We claim that at least one of the equalities

$$\text{cr}_{W' \setminus \{b\}}(w_a w_i, f) = \text{cr}_{W'}(w_a w_i, f) \quad \text{or} \quad \text{cr}_{W' \setminus \{a\}}(w_b w_i, f) = \text{cr}_{W'}(w_b w_i, f)$$

is satisfied; this will imply the lemma by taking $W = W' \setminus \{b\}$ or $W = W' \setminus \{a\}$. Suppose the contrary. Then w_b is inside a bigon B_b between a part of $w_a w_i$ and f , and w_a is inside a bigon B_a between a part of $w_b w_i$ and f . We assume that B_a and B_b are smallest such bigons. Note that either of the edges of the triangle $w_a w_b w_i$ can intersect the inside of B_a or B_b . However, w_a and w_i are not inside B_b , since they are connected to w_c and w_d by edges adjacent to $w_a w_i$ and f . Similarly, w_b and w_i are not inside B_a . In fact, B , B_a and B_b are the smallest bigons between f and a part of an edge of the triangle $w_a w_b w_i$ that contain w_i , w_a and w_b , respectively. Since the edges e , $w_a w_i$ and $w_b w_i$ are pairwise adjacent, they do not cross, and this implies that the bigons B , B_a and B_b are disjoint; see Figure 13. Let x_i be a point on e on the boundary of B , w_a a point on $w_b w_i$ on the boundary of B_a , and x_b a point on $w_a w_i$ on the boundary of B_b . By joining x_i with w_i inside B , x_a with w_a inside B_a , and x_b with w_b inside B_b , we obtain a plane drawing of $K_{3,3}$; a contradiction. $\square$

Now assume that e and f cross an odd number of times. In this case, we find another pair of edges crossing evenly.

Lemma 28. *If e and f cross oddly and at least three times in D , then there are two independent edges e', f' such that $\text{cr}(e', f')$ is even and $\text{cr}(e', f') \geq 2$.*

Proof. By Lemma 8, there is a bigon B between e and f . Let w_i be a vertex inside B . Every edge connecting w_i with an endpoint of e or f crosses f or e at least once. By Observation 24, at least one of these four edges crosses each of e and f an even number of times. $\square$

5 Picture hanging without crossings

Let $\Sigma = \Sigma_{0,n}$ be a closed compact surface of genus 0 with n boundary components. We may construct Σ from the sphere by removing n small open discs whose closures are disjoint. By a *homotopy* of a curve in Σ we mean a homotopy relative to the boundary of Σ . For two curves α, β in Σ , we denote by $\text{cr}_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta)$ the minimum number of crossings between two curves from the homotopy classes of α and β in Σ .

We show a construction of two simple curves α, β in Σ such that the endpoints of the curves are in different boundary components, $\text{cr}_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \geq 1$ (in fact, this intersection number is exponentially large), but after filling either of the n boundary components with a disc, in the resulting surface $\Sigma' = \Sigma_{0,n-1}$ we have $\text{cr}_{\Sigma'}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. This implies that in general, there is no configuration of bounded size “responsible” for the fact that two curves in Σ cross, and that the results in the previous section do not generalize to nonsimple drawings.

The concept is analogous to the *picture-hanging puzzles* investigated by Demaine et al. [6]. The goal of the basic picture-hanging puzzle is to hang a picture on a wall using k nails and a rope, so that by removing any of the nails the picture falls down. In our case, the goal is slightly different: we require that the rope does not cross itself, and that by removing any of the k nails, the picture and the rope fall below a certain threshold, but not necessarily completely on the floor.

The connection between these two problems is the following: the curve β represents a horizontal line of given height, the curve α represents the rope, with endpoints below β , and the $k = n - 4$ boundary components of Σ that contain no endpoint of α or β represent the nails. In our construction, exactly one of the nails, N_0 , is above β and all the other nails are below β . Therefore, we require only that after removing either of the nails, the rope falls below the nail N_0 .

Figure 14 shows our construction with two, three and four nails. The construction for more than four nails proceeds by induction. In each step, starting with the construction with $k \geq 2$ nails, we introduce a nail N_k to the right of α and below β , and move the nail N_{k-1} counterclockwise around N_k and then to the left, “dragging” the curve α along.

Alternatively, we can describe the construction as a result of the action of certain generators of the braid group B_k . We start with k nails $N_1, N_0, N_2, N_3, \dots, N_{k-1}$ arranged in a row from left to right, and with the rope α wrapped just once around N_1 . Then we deform the surface by exchanging some pairs of consecutive nails, “dragging” the surface with the rope along. In every such exchange of N_i with N_j , the nail N_i is moved either above N_j or below N_j . Every such exchange induces a homeomorphism of Σ that permutes the boundary components. We denote a homeomorphism of this form by h_i^+ if the i th nail from the left is moved below the $(i+1)$ st nail from the left, and by h_i^- if the i th nail from the left is moved above the $(i+1)$ st nail from the left. The construction with two nails is then obtained from the initial configuration by applying h_1^- , the construction with three nails by the composition $h_1^- h_2^+ h_2^+ h_1^+$, the construction with four nails by the composition $h_1^- h_2^+ h_2^+ h_1^+ h_3^+ h_3^+ h_2^+ h_1^+$. In




Figure 14: After removing either of the nails N_i , all crossings between α and β can be eliminated.




Figure 15: A train track representation of the construction with five nails. The numbers indicate the multiplicity of the curve inside the corresponding branches. At every switch, the total multiplicity on both sides is the same.

general, for $k \geq 2$, the construction with $k + 1$ nails is obtained from the construction with k nails by the composition $h_k^+ h_k^+ h_{k-1}^+ h_{k-2}^+ \dots h_1^+$.

We can also draw the construction concisely as a *train track*, see Figure 15.

Finally, in the same way as Demaine et al. [6], we can also describe the curve α as an element of a k -generated free subgroup of the fundamental group of Σ , where each generator x_i corresponds to wrapping the rope around the nail N_i . To express the homotopy class of α in the construction with k nails, we need a product of $3 + (k - 2)2^{k-1}$ generators x_i or x_i^{-1} . Due to the special nature of the generators x_{k-1} and x_0 , we write y for x_{k-1} and z for x_0 . For example, the constructions with two, three and four nails are expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g_2 &= zy^{-1}z^{-1}, \\ g_3 &= zy^{-1}z^{-1}x_1^{-1}zyz^{-1}, \\ g_4 &= zy^{-1}z^{-1}x_1^{-1}x_2^{-1}x_1zyz^{-1}x_1^{-1}zy^{-1}z^{-1}x_1^{-1}x_2x_1zyz^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In general, for $k \geq 3$, g_{k+1} is created from g_k by the substitution

$$y \rightarrow y^{-1}z^{-1}x_1^{-1} \dots x_{k-3}^{-1}x_{k-2}x_{k-3} \dots x_1zy.$$

We introduce the following total ordering on the nails and a corresponding total ordering on

the generators:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &\prec N_2 \prec \dots \prec N_{k-2} \prec N_{k-1} \prec N_0, \\ x_1 &\prec x_2 \prec \dots \prec x_{k-2} \prec y \prec z. \end{aligned}$$

The following claim shows the main property of our construction.

Claim 29. *Let $k \geq 2$ and consider the construction with k nails. Let $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$. When the nail N_i is removed, the rope will disentangle from all the nails N_j such that $N_i \prec N_j$.*

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on k . In the group setting, we need to show that after substituting $x_i = 1$ to g_k and reducing the resulting word, all occurrences of x_j and x_j^{-1} such that $x_i \prec x_j$ will be eliminated. The claim is clearly true when $k = 2$ or $x_i = z$.

We claim that for every $k \geq 2$, every occurrence of y or y^{-1} in g_k is preceded by z and followed by z^{-1} . This is clearly true for $k = 2$, and for $k \geq 3$ it follows by induction, since every occurrence of y or y^{-1} in g_k is either the first or the last symbol in the word substituted for some occurrence of y or y^{-1} in g_{k-1} , and the substituted word starts with $y^{-1}z^{-1}$ and ends with zy . Therefore, the claim is true for $x_i = y$ and arbitrary $k \geq 2$.

Now let $k \geq 3$ and assume that the claim holds for $k-1$ nails. Every occurrence of x_{k-2} or x_{k-2}^{-1} in g_k appears as the middle symbol in the word substituted for some occurrence of y or y^{-1} in g_{k-1} . By setting $x_{k-2} = 1$ and reducing, all the substituted symbols in g_k are eliminated, including all the occurrences of y . Hence, setting $x_{k-2} = 1$ in g_k has the same effect as setting $y = 1$ in g_{k-1} . Therefore, the claim is true when $i = k-2$.

Assume that $i \leq k-3$. By the induction assumption, setting $x_i = 1$ in g_{k-1} and reducing eliminates all occurrences of x_j and x_j^{-1} with $i \prec j$, including all occurrences of y and y^{-1} . This implies that the same word is obtained by setting $x_i = 1$ in g_k and reducing, regardless of the word that was substituted for y . Since all the occurrences of x_{k-2} or x_{k-2}^{-1} in g_k were in the words substituted for y in g_{k-1} , they were also eliminated. This finishes the proof of the claim. $\square$

6 Independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability

6.1 Algebraic algorithm

By the Hanani–Tutte theorem, planarity testing can be reduced to solving a system of linear equations over $\mathbb{Z}_2$ [24, Section 1.4.1]. The same algebraic method can be used for testing independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability of general AT-graphs. Pach and Tóth described a slightly more general method for proving the NP-completeness of the odd crossing number [22], where they also took the rotation system into account. We now describe the method in detail, since it will serve as a basis for the proof of Theorem 3.

Let $(G, \mathcal{X})$ be a given AT-graph and let D be an arbitrary drawing of G . For example, we may place the vertices of G on a circle in an arbitrary order and draw every edge as a straight-line segment. We use the “obvious” fact that every drawing of G can be obtained from any other drawing of G by a homeomorphism of the plane, which aligns the vertices of the two drawings, followed by a sequence of finitely many continuous deformations (isotopies) of the edges that keep the endpoints fixed, and maintain the property that every pair of edges have only finitely many points in common at each moment of the deformation (we will call such deformations *generic*). This fact can be proved using the Jordan–Schönflies theorem.




Figure 16: A continuous deformation of e resulting in an edge-vertex switch (e, v) .

We will assume that the positions of the vertices are fixed. The algorithm will test whether the edges of the initial drawing D can be continuously deformed to form an independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realization of $(G, \mathcal{X})$. During a generic continuous deformation from D to some other drawing D' , three types of combinatorially interesting events can happen:

- 1) two edges exchanging their order around their common vertex and creating a new crossing,
- 2) an edge passing over another edge, forming a pair of new crossings and a lens between them,
- 3) an edge e passing over a vertex v not incident to e , creating a crossing with every edge incident to v .

Each of the three events has also a corresponding inverse event, where crossings are eliminated. However, the effects on the parity of the number of crossings between edges are the same. The parity of the number of crossings between a pair of independent edges is affected only during the event 3) or its inverse, in which case we change the parity of the number of crossings of e with all the edges incident to v ; see Figure 16. We call such an event an *edge-vertex switch* and we will denote it by the ordered pair (e, v) . We will consider drawings up to the equivalence generated by events of type 1) and 2) and their inverses. Every edge-vertex switch (e, v) can be performed independently of others, for any initial drawing, by deforming the edge e along a curve connecting an interior point of e with v . We can thus represent the deformation from D to D' by the set of edge-vertex switches that were performed an odd number of times during the deformation.

A drawing D of G can then be represented by a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^M$ where M is the number of unordered pairs of independent edges in G . The component of $\mathbf{v}$ corresponding to a pair $\{e, f\}$ is 1 if e and f cross an odd number of times and 0 otherwise. We remark that the space $\mathbb{Z}_2^M$ can also be considered as the space of subgraphs of the complement of the line graph $L(G)$. If $G = K_n$, then the complement of $L(G)$ is the Kneser graph $KG_{n,2}$.

Let e be an edge of G and v a vertex of G such that $v \notin e$. Performing an edge-vertex switch (e, v) corresponds to adding the vector $\mathbf{w}_{(e,v)} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^M$ whose only components equal to 1 are those indexed by pairs $\{e, f\}$ where f is incident to v . The set of all drawings of G that can be obtained from D by edge-vertex switches then corresponds to an affine subspace $\mathbf{v} + W$ where W is the subspace generated by the set $\{\mathbf{w}_{(e,v)}; v \in V(G), e \in E(G), v \notin e\}$.

An AT-graph $(G, \mathcal{X})$ can similarly be represented by the vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^M$ whose component corresponding to a pair $\{e, f\}$ is 1 if and only if $\{e, f\} \in \mathcal{X}$. In other words, $\mathbf{x}$ is the characteristic vector of $\mathcal{X}$. Now $(G, \mathcal{X})$ is independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable if and only if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{v} + W$,

equivalently, $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v} \in W$. This is equivalent to the solvability of a system of M linear equations over $\mathbb{Z}_2$, where each variable corresponds to one edge-vertex switch. In general, the vectors $\mathbf{w}_{(e,v)}$ are not linearly independent, so the number of variables in the system could be slightly reduced.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 3

We start with the following well-known fact, which implies that the condition of having no even K_5 and no odd $2K_3$ is necessary for independent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizability of complete AT-graphs.

Observation 30. *The number of pairs of independent edges crossing an odd number of times is odd in every drawing of K_5 and even in every drawing of $2K_3$.*

Proof. The convex drawing of K_5 , with vertices on a circle and with straight-line edges, has exactly five independent odd-crossing pairs of edges. Every edge-vertex switch (e, v) changes the parity of the number of crossings for exactly two pairs of edges, $\{e, f_1\}$ and $\{e, f_2\}$, where f_1 and f_2 are the two edges incident with v but vertex-disjoint with e . Therefore, the number of independent odd-crossing pairs of edges remains odd after an arbitrary sequence of edge-vertex switches. The argument for $2K_3$ is analogous. $\square$

It remains to show that complete AT-graphs with no even K_5 and no odd $2K_3$ are independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable.

Let $(K_n, \mathcal{X})$ be a complete AT-graph with no even K_5 and no odd $2K_3$. Let $M = 3 \cdot \binom{n}{4}$ be the number of (unordered) pairs of independent edges in K_n . Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^M$ be the characteristic vector of $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^M$ be the vector representing an arbitrary drawing of K_n . By Observation 30, the vector $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}$ represents a complete AT-graph with no odd K_5 and no odd $2K_3$; we will call these properties the *K_5 -property* and the *$2K_3$ -property*, respectively. Let $U \leq \mathbb{Z}_2^M$ be the subspace of all vectors with the *K_5 -property* and the *$2K_3$ -property*. Let $W \leq \mathbb{Z}_2^M$ be the subspace generated by the vectors $\mathbf{w}_{(e,v)}$, defined in the previous subsection. By the proof of Observation 30, we have $W \leq U$. We now show that $W = U$, which will imply the theorem.

Let $\mathbf{u}_0 \in U$. By adding certain generators $\mathbf{w}_{(e,v)}$ to $\mathbf{u}_0$, we will gradually set all the coordinates to zero, in $2n - 3$ steps, building a sequence of vectors $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{2n-3}$. In each step, we choose an edge e of K_n and set all the coordinates $\{e, f\}$ to zero. We will call this *clearing* the edge e . Likewise, we call an edge e *clear* with respect to $\mathbf{u}_k$ if all the coordinates $\{e, f\}$ of $\mathbf{u}_k$ are zero.

Let $\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$ be the vertex set of K_n . In steps $1, 2, \dots, n - 1$, we clear the edges $v_0v_1, v_0v_2, \dots, v_0v_{n-1}$, respectively. In step i , whenever a coordinate $\{v_0v_i, f\}$ of $\mathbf{u}_{i-1}$ is equal to 1, we add the generator $\mathbf{w}_{(f,v_i)}$, which changes the coordinate $\{v_0v_i, f\}$ to 0 but does not affect any other coordinate of the form $\{v_0v_j, g\}$. Thus, adding the necessary generators in step i keeps the edges v_0v_j clear for $j < i$. Hence, after the first $n - 1$ steps, every edge incident to v_0 is clear with respect to $\mathbf{u}_{n-1}$.

In the remaining $n - 2$ steps, we want to clear all the edges v_1v_i for $i \geq 2$. Since we also want to keep all the edges incident to v_0 clear, we cannot just add the generator $\mathbf{w}_{(f,v_i)}$ if we want to set a coordinate $\{v_1v_i, f\}$ to zero. Thus, we will restrict ourselves to adding only those vectors of W that have all the coordinates $\{v_0v_i, f\}$ equal to zero. For every

$i, j \in \{i, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, $i \neq j$, let

$$\mathbf{y}_{i,j} = \mathbf{w}_{(v_0 v_i, v_j)} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n-1; k \neq i,j} \mathbf{w}_{(v_j v_k, v_i)}.$$

The nonzero coordinates of $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$ are exactly those pairs $\{v_i v_k, v_j v_l\}$ where $k, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ and i, j, k, l are distinct. In the remaining steps, we will be adding only the vectors $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$. These vectors are a rather blunt tool compared to the vectors $\mathbf{w}_{(e,v)}$. Fortunately, they will be sufficient for clearing the edges $v_1 v_i$ thanks to the $2K_3$ -property and the K_5 -property.

Observation 31. *If all the edges incident to v_0 are clear with respect to a vector $\mathbf{u} \in U$, then the set $E_{v_1 v_i}$ of edges f such that the coordinate $\{v_1 v_i, f\}$ is nonzero in $\mathbf{u}$ forms a complete bipartite graph on the vertex set $\{v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{n-1}\} \setminus \{v_i\}$; this also includes the possibility of the empty graph.*

Proof. The $2K_3$ -property applied to the triangle $v_0 v_1 v_i$ and every triangle induced by $\{v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{n-1}\} \setminus \{v_i\}$ implies that $E_{v_1 v_i}$ has an even number of edges in every triangle induced by $\{v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{n-1}\} \setminus \{v_i\}$. This implies that each connected component of the complement $E_{v_1 v_i}^c$ of $E_{v_1 v_i}$ is a complete graph, and that the number of components of $E_{v_1 v_i}^c$ is at most 2. This is equivalent to $E_{v_1 v_i}$ being complete bipartite or empty. $\square$

Let $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, n-1\}$ and suppose that the vector $\mathbf{u}_{n+i-3}$ has been computed. Let $E_{v_1 v_i}$ be the set of edges f such that the coordinate $\{v_1 v_i, f\}$ is nonzero in $\mathbf{u}_{n+i-3}$. If $E_{v_1 v_i} = \emptyset$, we set $\mathbf{u}_{n+i-2} = \mathbf{u}_{n+i-3}$. Otherwise $E_{v_1 v_i}$ is complete bipartite by Observation 31. Let (A, B) be the bipartition of $\{v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{n-1}\} \setminus \{v_i\}$ that induces $E_{v_1 v_i}$.

Observation 32. *All the vertices $\{v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{i-1}\}$ lie in the same part of the bipartition (A, B) .*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $v_j \in A$ and $v_k \in B$, for some $j, k \in \{2, 3, \dots, i-1\}$. In the complete subgraph induced by the vertices v_0, v_1, v_i, v_j, v_k , only the edges $v_1 v_i$ and $v_j v_k$ are not clear with respect to $\mathbf{u}_{n+i-3}$, and the pair $\{v_1 v_i, v_j v_k\}$ is the only nonzero coordinate in $\mathbf{u}_{n+i-3}$ induced by the vertices v_0, v_1, v_i, v_j, v_k . This contradicts the K_5 -property. $\square$

Assume without loss of generality that $\{v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{i-1}\} \subseteq A$. We set

$$\mathbf{u}_{n+i-2} = \mathbf{u}_{n+i-3} + \sum_{v_j \in B} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}.$$

All edges incident with v_0 are clear in $\mathbf{u}_{n+i-2}$, since this is true for all the summands. By adding $\sum_{v_j \in B} \mathbf{y}_{i,j}$, we have cleared the edge $v_1 v_i$, while keeping the coordinates $\{v_1 v_j, f\}$ unchanged for $j \in A$. Thus, all the edges $v_1 v_j$ with $2 \leq j \leq i$ are clear with respect to $\mathbf{u}_{n+i-2}$. Consequently, all edges incident with v_0 or v_1 are clear with respect to $\mathbf{u}_{2n-3}$. The following observation finishes the proof.

Observation 33. *We have $\mathbf{u}_{2n-3} = \mathbf{0}$.*

Proof. Let $i, j, k, l \in \{2, 3, \dots, n-1\}$ be distinct integers. Since all edges incident with v_0 or v_1 are clear with respect to $\mathbf{u}_{2n-3}$, the $2K_3$ -property applied to the two triangles $v_0 v_i v_k$ and $v_1 v_j v_l$ implies that the coordinate $\{v_i v_k, v_j v_l\}$ is zero in $\mathbf{u}_{2n-3}$. $\square$

6.3 Concluding remarks

Minimality of the characterization. Here we show that none of the two fs in Theorem 3 can be omitted. This is equivalent to the fact that for n large enough, there is a vector in $\mathbb{Z}_2^M$ with the K_5 -property that does not have the $2K_3$ -property, and another vector with the $2K_3$ -property that does not have the K_5 -property.

Assume that the vertex set of K_6 is $\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_5\}$. The complete AT-graph $(K_6, \{\{v_0v_1, v_2v_3\}, \{v_2v_3, v_4v_5\}, \{v_0v_1, v_4v_5\}\})$ has no even K_5 , but it is not independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable since the triangles $v_0v_1v_4$ and $v_2v_3v_5$ form an odd $2K_3$.

The other example is trivial: the AT-graph $(K_5, \emptyset)$ has no odd $2K_3$ but it is not independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable since it is an even K_5 .

Drawings of K_6 . We conclude with the following interpretation of the characterization of independently $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -realizable complete AT-graphs with six vertices. In the proof of Theorem 3 we have shown that by edge-vertex switches, we can transform any drawing of K_6 to a drawing where all the edges incident to a chosen vertex v_0 cross every independent edge an even number of times. The drawings with this property can be represented as subgraphs of the Kneser graph $KG_{5,2}$, which is isomorphic to the Petersen graph. The $2K_3$ -property now corresponds to the cycle space of the Petersen graph, and together with the K_5 -property, they correspond to the even cycle space of the Petersen graph; that is, Eulerian subgraphs with even number of edges. The even cycle space of the Petersen graph has dimension 5, and contains 10 subgraphs isomorphic to C_6 , 15 subgraphs isomorphic to C_8 , and 6 subgraphs isomorphic to $2C_5$. However, the vectors characterizing the drawings of K_6 satisfy the $2K_3$ property but do not satisfy the K_5 -property, so they correspond to the 32 odd cycles in the Petersen graph, 12 of them isomorphic to C_5 and the remaining 20 isomorphic to C_9 .

For $n = 6$, the whole space U of the vectors with the K_5 -property and the $2K_3$ -property has dimension 35, since each of the 30 edge-vertex switches (e, v) with $v \neq v_0$ and $v_0 \notin e$ changes the parity of the number of crossings for exactly one pair of edges of the type $\{v_0v_i, f\}$.

Acknowledgements

I thank Martin Balko for his comments on an early version of the manuscript. I also thank the reviewers of the conference version for their suggestions for improving the presentation.

References

- [1] B. M. Ábrego, O. Aichholzer, S. Fernández-Merchant, T. Hackl, J. Pammer, A. Pilz, P. Ramos, G. Salazar and B. Vogtenhuber, All good drawings of small complete graphs, *EuroCG 2015, Book of abstracts*, 57–60, 2015.
- [2] O. Aichholzer, personal communication, 2014.
- [3] L. Armas-Sanabria, F. González-Acuña and J. Rodríguez-Viorato, Self-intersection numbers of paths in compact surfaces, *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications* **20**(3) (2011), 403–410.
- [4] M. Balko, R. Fulek and J. Kynčl, Crossing numbers and combinatorial characterization of monotone drawings of K_n , *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **53**(1) (2015), 107–143.

- [5] M. Chimani, Facets in the crossing number polytope, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **25**(1) (2011), 95–111.
- [6] E. D. Demaine, M. Demaine, Y. N. Minsky, J. S. Mitchell, R. L. Rivest and M. Pătraşcu, Picture-hanging puzzles, *Theory of Computing Systems* **54**(4) (2014), 531–550.
- [7] B. Farb and B. Thurston, Homeomorphisms and simple closed curves, unpublished manuscript.
- [8] E. Gioan, Complete graph drawings up to triangle mutations, *Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **3787**, 139–150, Springer, Berlin, 2005.
- [9] H. Hanani, Über wesentlich unplättbare Kurven im drei-dimensionalen Raume, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* **23** (1934), 135–142.
- [10] H. Harborth and I. Mengersen, Drawings of the complete graph with maximum number of crossings, *Proceedings of the Twenty-third Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing* (Boca Raton, FL, 1992), *Congressus Numerantium* **88** (1992), 225–228.
- [11] J. Hass and P. Scott, Intersections of curves on surfaces, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **51**(1-2) (1985), 90–120.
- [12] C.-P. Jeannerod, LSP Matrix Decomposition Revisited, Laboratoire de l’Informatique du Parallélisme, École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, Research Report RR2006-28 (2006), <http://www.ens-lyon.fr/LIP/Pub/Rapports/RR/RR2006/RR2006-28.pdf>.
- [13] J. Kratochvíl, String graphs. II. Recognizing string graphs is NP-hard, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **52** (1991), 67–78.
- [14] J. Kratochvíl, A. Lubiw and J. Nešetřil, Noncrossing subgraphs in topological layouts, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **4**(2) (1991), 223–244.
- [15] J. Kratochvíl and J. Matoušek, NP-hardness results for intersection graphs, *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae* **30** (1989), 761–773.
- [16] J. Kynčl, Enumeration of simple complete topological graphs, *European Journal of Combinatorics* **30**(7) (2009), 1676–1685.
- [17] J. Kynčl, Simple realizability of complete abstract topological graphs in P, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **45**(3) (2011), 383–399.
- [18] J. Kynčl, Improved enumeration of simple topological graphs, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **50**(3) (2013), 727–770.
- [19] F. Le Gall, Powers of tensors and fast matrix multiplication, [arXiv:1401.7714v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1401.7714) (2014).
- [20] P. Mutzel, Recent advances in exact crossing minimization (extended abstract), *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* **31** (2008), 33–36.
- [21] M. J. Pelsmayer, M. Schaefer and D. Štefankovič, Crossing numbers of graphs with rotation systems, *Algorithmica* **60**(3) (2011), 679–702.

- [22] J. Pach and G. Tóth, Which crossing number is it anyway?, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **80**(2) (2000), 225–246.
- [23] J. Pach and G. Tóth, How many ways can one draw a graph?, *Combinatorica* **26**(5) (2006), 559–576.
- [24] M. Schaefer, Hanani-Tutte and related results, *Geometry—intuitive, discrete, and convex*, vol. 24 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, 259–299, János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest (2013).
- [25] M. Schaefer, The graph crossing number and its variants: A survey, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, Dynamic Survey 21 (2014).
- [26] M. Schaefer, E. Sedgwick and D. Štefankovič, Computing Dehn twists and geometric intersection numbers in polynomial time, *Proceedings of the 20th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG 2008)*, 111–114, 2008.
- [27] L. A. Székely, A successful concept for measuring non-planarity of graphs: the crossing number, *Discrete Mathematics* **276**(1-3) (2004), 331–352.
- [28] W. T. Tutte, Toward a theory of crossing numbers, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory* **8** (1970), 45–53.
- [29] V. V. Williams, Multiplying matrices faster than Coppersmith-Winograd, *Proceedings of the Forty-fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '12, 887–898, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2012).